

4,4'-diaminobenzanilide, 4,4'-bis(p-aminophenoxy)diphenylsufone and 2,2-bis[4-(4-aminophenoxy)phenyl]propane.--

--10. The flexible printed board according to claim 7, wherein the aromatic acid dianhydride is selected from the group consisting of pyromellitic dianhydride, 3,4,3',4'-biphenyltetracarboxylic dianhydride, 3,4,3',4'-benzophenonetetracarboxylic dianhydride, and 3,4,3',4'-diphenylsulfonetetracarboxylic dianhydride. --

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending herein. By this amendment, claim 7 is amended, and new claims 8-10 are added. No claim is canceled.

The attached Appendix includes marked-up copies of each rewritten paragraph (37 C.F.R. §1.121(b)(1)(iii)) and claim (37 C.F.R. §1.121(c)(1)(ii)).

Support for the amendment of claim 7 can be found in claims 1 and 3 as originally filed. Support for new claims 8-10 can be found, for example, in claims 4-6 as originally filed. Thus, this amendment does not introduce new matter.

I. Election and Restriction Requirements

Applicants hereby affirm the election to prosecute the invention of Group II (claim 7), made on April 26, 2002. The Restriction Requirement is respectfully traversed.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that Groups I and II are related as an intermediate and final product. Applicants submit that Groups I and II are sufficiently related such that a search of either group would encompass a search of the subject matter of the other group. The prior art revealed by a search of the polyamic acid varnish composition of Group I would overlap the prior art revealed by a search of the flexible printed board of Group II and vice versa. Thus, although the classifications may be different, the subject matter is sufficiently overlapping that concurrent search of all of the claims does not create a serious burden.

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent claims. MPEP §803. Applicants respectfully submit that there would be no serious burden on the Patent Office to examine all of the present claims because the subject matter of Groups I and II is sufficiently related that a search of any one group would encompass the search of the subject matter of the remaining groups.

Thus, the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

II. Oath or Declaration

The Office Action asserts that the Declaration submitted on December 7, 2000, is defective because one of the applicants, Mr. Noriaki Kudo, signed on the wrong line. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Although the Mr. Kudo signed the Declaration on the wrong line, all the required information required in accordance with 37 CFR §1.63 and §1.68 is present in the Declaration as filed. The asserted basis for requiring a new Declaration does not indicate that the wording is not correct, that required affirmations have not been made, or that the Declaration has not been properly subscribed to. Thus, the Office Action has failed to provide any appropriate basis for requiring a new Declaration.

III. Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification for minor informalities. The specification is amended to correct the informalities.

In view of the amendment of the specification, Applicants submit that the objection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection under §102

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Hashimoto et al. (US 6,346,598). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 7 specifies specific imidazolyl-diaminoazine additives that are not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, Hashimoto fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In view of the amendment of claim 7 and the above remarks, Applicants submit that the cited reference does not anticipate the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 8-10 are also allowable over Hashimoto for the reasons discussed above.

V. Rejection under §103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kaneko et al. in view of Hashimoto et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 7 specifies specific imidazolyl-diaminoazine additives that are not disclosed in either of the cited references. Moreover, neither Kaneko nor Hashimoto teaches or suggests that the compounds disclosed therein could or should be substituted by the specifically claimed compounds of instant claim 7 to provide the recited varnish for the claimed flexible printed board. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been able to derive the claimed invention based on the combined teachings of Hashimoto and Kaneko.

For at least these reasons, claim 7 would not have been obvious over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 8-10 are also allowable over Kaneko and Hashimoto for the reasons discussed above.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen Tu
Registration No. 52,304

JAO/SXT:hs

Date: November 20, 2002

Attachment:
Appendix

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--

APPENDIX

Changes to Specification:

Page 1, line 4, BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

Page 2, line 20, SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

Changes to Claims:

Claims 8-10 are added.

The following is a marked-up version of the amended claim(s):

7. (Amended) A flexible printed board having a polyimide insulating layer furnished on a metal foil, wherein the polyimide insulating layer is formed by forming a film of thea polyamic acid varnish composition according to Claim 1 comprising a polyamic acid obtained by the addition polymerization of an aromatic diamine and an aromatic acid dianhydride, and a solvent, wherein said polyamic acid varnish composition contains as an additive an imidazolyl-diaminoazine is selected from the group consisting of:

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2-methyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2-ethyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(1-(2-undecyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-ethyl-4-imidazolyl) -s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(4-methyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-ethyl-5-methyl-4-imidazolyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(4-ethyl-2-methyl-1-imidazolyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(3-(2-methyl-1-imidazolyl)propyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(4-(2-imidazolyl)butyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2-methyl-1-imidazolyl)propyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(1-methyl-2-(2-methyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2,5-dimethyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine;

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2,4-dimethyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine; and

2,4-diamino-6-(2-(2-ethyl-4-methyl-1-imidazolyl)ethyl)-s-triazine

on the metal foil, followed by imidizing.